

**Coconino County Planning and Zoning Commission  
Meeting of October 28th, 2015  
Board of Supervisors' Meeting Room  
County Administrative Center  
219 East Cherry  
Flagstaff, Arizona**

**Members Present**

Don Walters - Chairman  
Sat Best  
Jack Doggett  
Tammy Ontiveros- Vice- Chair  
John Ruggles  
Maggie Sacher  
Mary Williams

**Members Absent**

Wynne Geikenjoyner

**Staff Present**

Jason Christelman, Director  
Bob Short, Principal. Planner  
Zach Schwartz, Planner  
Kate Morley, Planner  
Tim McNeel, Deputy County Attorney  
Kendra Crawford, Recording Secretary

Chairman Walters called the meeting to order at 5:30PM. He noted procedures to the audience.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Minutes of September 16<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup>, 2015- Commissioner Doggett, would like to revise the September 30<sup>th</sup> minutes. On page nine, the first sentence of paragraph seven “area plan” should be changed to say “area subdivision plat and observed numerous larger lots”. Commissioner Doggett made a motion to approve the minutes of September 30, 2015 as written by staff with the one change. Commissioner Ruggles seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Commissioner Best would like to revise the September 16' 2015 minutes. At the bottom of page two and the top of page three "vegetation plan" should be changed to "invasive weed plan". Commissioner Best made a motion to approve the September 16' 2015 minutes as written by staff with the two changes. Commissioner Ontiveros seconded the motion. The minutes were approved 5-0-2 with Commissioner Sacher and Commissioner Doggett abstaining.

## **II. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- 1 Case No. ZC-15-004 and CUP-15-015: A request for a Zone Change from General (G) Zone (10-acre minimum) to M1-10,000 (Light Industrial, with a 10,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size) Zone for an office and contractor's yard, also requiring Conditional Use Permit to allow for a contractor's yard in the M1-10,000 Zone. This property consists of 10 acres and is located on the south side W. Route 66 just west of Flagstaff Ranch Road and is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 116-04-004V.  
Applicant: Mogollon Engineering, Flagstaff, AZ  
Property Owner: Ed Van Beek, Chino Valley, AZ  
Supervisory District 1 (Art Babbott)

Mr. Christelman summarized the staff report along with a PowerPoint presentation stating if the Commissioner can make the required Findings, staff recommended listed conditions. Commissioner Best and Chairman Walters commented on the maps and Regional Plan shown in the Power Point.

Chairman Walters asked Mr. Christelman to explain the difference between the Regional Plan and the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Christelman explained the Comprehensive Plan is what the County uses to make the Findings of Fact for land use within the County. The City of Flagstaff's Regional Plan encompasses some elements of the County but for this area we use both documents to make the decision. Commissioner Ruggles asked about the letter that Community Development sent to the public notifying them about this meeting. He wanted to know what the letter said and how many people received it. Mr. Christelman explained Community Notifications were sent to neighbors in 1000 sq. feet instead of the normal 300. Commissioner Ruggles stated from the Arizona Revised State Statutes, it says that if 20 percent of the surrounding property owners did not agree with what the applicant is proposing, it goes straight to the Board of Supervisors, this was not stated in the Notice.

Commissioner Doggett asked if the zone change was from a planning perspective versus the CUP which has the specifics of the applicant's site plan. While reviewing this he noticed the zoning of the other properties to the east and west and in the Comprehensive plan it talks about transitional zoning. This property seems like it would be a good candidate. It is between existing housing, a large lot, high end housing and existing light industrial. Was this addressed? Mr. Christelman explained that the transitional zoning did come up at a meeting with the applicant and representative, instead of M-1-10,000 abutting the RR5, there would be a commercial zone in between but the applicant chose not to do that.

Commissioner Best asked if there was a forest thinning plan in place. Mr. Christelman said the applicant put in their narrative that they would participate in forest thinning but does not currently have one.

Commissioner Williams stated she is concerned that if this property is rezoned to M-1-10,000 that other properties in this area will be re-zoned, especially the adjacent 57 acres. Commissioner Williams asked if it is pushing the long term in that direction. Mr. Christelman explained to the Commission that is something they need to consider before setting a precedence.

Commissioner Ontiveros stated when she was reading the staff report, she noticed there were quite a few attachments including pictures of Mr. Van Beek's Chino Valley, Arizona Construction yard. Commissioner Ontiveros wanted to know if the pictures had been verified. Mr. Christelman stated that he had not personally verified those pictures but the applicant is here and can answer if the construction yard looks like the picture.

Commissioner Ontiveros asked about an attached letter written by Wenda Seltzer referring to the draft of the Coconino County Comprehensive Plan. She read from the letter talking about the zoning for the Commission, then asked if this is a fact. Mr. Christelman replied that the letter speaks to the updated version of the Comprehensive Plan that is currently in the process of being adopted. The Comprehensive Plan Update is on the Board of Supervisors Agenda in November 2015 for adoption.

Commissioner Ontiveros asked if in the Regional plan there is any similar wording. They would like to see the appropriately zoned properties used prior to re-zoning. Mr. Christelman replied the comments he received from Sarah Dector, were provided in the Power Point.

Commissioner Ontiveros asked Mr. Christelman after visiting the site numerous times, did he personally hear noise from the Waste Management facility, specifically the backup warning? Mr. Christelman stated that he did hear the Waste Management trucks the second time he visited the subject property quite clearly and multiple times. He concluded that this property is not very far away.

No more questions for staff, opened to the representative for Naval Observatory.

David Hules, Naval Observatory, 10391 West Naval Observatory Road, Flagstaff, Arizona 86001, began by stating the mission of the Naval Observatory. Protecting the dark skies and observing the Coconino County Lighting Ordinance serves the Naval Observatory's Mission. Mr. Hules explained that the Naval Observatory is 1.5 miles west of the subject property. This property is currently zoned General and is in Lighting Zone I of the Coconino County Ordinance and is permitted 10,000 lumens per residence. Re-Zoning this parcel to M-1-10,000 changes the maximum lumens of 25,000 lumens per acre, not per residence, which would be 250,000 lumens for the whole ten acre property. Mr. Hules explained that if the property is subdivided in the future the lumen rule would stay per acre not per residence.

Mr. Hules explained that the Coconino County Zoning Ordinance and the Flagstaff Regional Plan states that the Commission could recommend a condition that would make the number of lumens lower than the maximum. Mr. Hules read over the Coconino County Lighting Ordinance and Flagstaff Regional Plan for the Commission.

Mr. Hules stated that he has met with Mr. Van Beek regarding this property, its proximity to the Naval Observatory and the proposed re-zoning. Mr. Hules explained that the Navy is willing to offer the following recommendations regarding the lighting; the entire ten acre property shall support a maximum of 73,200 lumens, provided the lights be fully shielded, narrow spectrum amber LED and motion censored. This would bring the total lumens installed to 24,400 and then if the lights were under overhangs by 5 feet deep it would produce the rest of the lumens.

Commissioner Williams asked if when they were doing this analyses did they factor in the undeveloped, already zoned light industrial properties adjacent to this property? Mr. Hules replied the Naval Observatory is working to evaluate that issue and what the cumulative impact will be as properties are built out in the future. They have conducted an extensive inventory using the City and Counties information from the Geographic Information System department to identify what the existing land uses are, how much light is used, how it affects the dark sky and what's remaining to be developed.

Chairman Walters asked if the Naval Observatory has heard there is a push to revise the lighting statues and codes. Mr. Hales replied he is aware and they have been working closely with the Lighting group to evaluate the existing land uses and how the future lighting may affect the dark sky. They will be coming forward shortly with their findings and recommended changes. Chairman Walters asked if the recommendations they brought forward tonight are the same that they would be making in the upcoming Ordinance meetings. Mr. Hules replied those are preliminary. They are still working on what thresholds of future lighting could be designed to stay under the maximum lumens for the Observatory. Chairman Walters asked if the applicant agreed with these new recommendations, would the Naval Observatory support this from a lighting aspect. Mr. Hules replied yes they would support the lighting conditions but could not say they would support the project.

There were no more questions for Mr. Hules. The Commission called the applicant or his representative to the podium.

Ed Van Beek, Po Box 38606 Mormon Lake, Arizona, 86038 discussed his history, background and what his work sites look like. He explained that the Chino Valley pictures may be what the site looks like but he does not own the parcel, he leases it from the previous business owner. His lease is up and because of this he has decided to buy a property in Flagstaff and relocate his business. Mr. Van Beek summarized the intention of the Use of this property pending the re-zone using a PowerPoint. He stated it is going to be used for a construction business office where equipment will be moved on and off for maintenance purposes. The equipment will be staged at this location but not stored there. He explained how his proposal has changed from the beginning of his request for the Zone Change until now. Mr. Van Beek went on to explain that he is respectful of the process and the people and that he has no hidden agenda.

Commissioner Ontiveros stated for the record, her opinion is unbiased and that is why she asked the question about the Chino Valley pictures.

Commissioner Sacher asked about the rendering he has on the slide show of what the proposed yard was going to look like. Are there always going to be big trucks there? Mr. Van Beek stated he just wanted to show what type of equipment would be on the property at certain times.

Commissioner Best asked about the vehicle back up alarms? He stated he has been on the property and that is the problem with the Waste Management property. Mr. Van Beek replied this is not a construction yard and there will not be work done here but equipment will come and go off the property.

Commissioner Williams asked when he was looking to move the business from Chino Valley to Flagstaff what made him choose General zoned property. Mr. Van Beek stated that he likes this parcel because it is close to two freeway interchanges.

Commissioner Ruggles asked if the realty company is still listing the property. Mr. Van Beek replied he had it listed for a while but the sign should be down as of now.

Commissioner Doggett asked what his thoughts were on how this property backed up to a high end residential neighborhood. Mr. Van Beek replied that turning his buildings to the east would create a buffer and would help with the noise of the vehicles.

Commissioner Doggett explained that there are two elements to this procedure; one is planning for the zoning case and the second is the CUP. When you look at this site, you can see what the Comprehensive Plan is talking about when they say transitional zoning. It's about blending Uses, and Finding of Fact. Commissioner Doggett asked if the applicant would be willing to move the Uses more east on the property, which would allow more space between the residences. He explained a little bit of his background as a Commercial Real Estate Agent in Coconino County. Commissioner Doggett further described that Coconino County's most impactful Use is a Contractors Yard, and asked the applicant if he would be willing to make the shift to transitional housing. Mr. Van Beek replied the larger buffer would create a bigger transient use and not help their problems. He explained what kind of buffer he planned to use for the Commission. Commissioner Sacher clarified the layout of the property; tree buffer, then the buildings and then the vehicles. Mr. Van Beek replied yes, that is how it would be set up. Chairman Walters asked if it is a 50 foot buffer with a berm. Mr. Van Beek replied the staff report states it was vegetation and a wall, within the 20 feet buffer. Commissioner Sacher asked if we have to cut down more trees to make a berm, wouldn't a wall work instead? Mr. Christelman replied that is a decision the Commission can make. Chairman Walters asked what other vegetation the applicant would like to put in. Mr. Van Beek replied deciduous trees to break it up such as spruce trees.

Chairman Walters asked if he has read the staff report and agrees with it. Mr. Van Beek said he has talked to the Naval Observatory and would like staff to change to their lighting recommendations. He is not sure about splitting the four acres instead of ten. Besides those yes.

Commissioner Ontiveros clarified the number of acres he would like to develop. Mr. Van Beek replied the acres they will be developing is four. Commissioner Ontiveros asked if the septic and detention are part of the four. Mr. Van Beek replied those will not be on these four acres. The staff report only talked about the four acres of light industrial, it did not include the septic and detention.

Kent Hotsenpiller, 411 W Santa Fe, Flagstaff, Arizona 86001, stated he is the engineering representative for Mr. Van Beek. As far as the septic and detention it will be a small area. He has talked with County staff about the issues. One of the reasons Mr. Van Beek chose this site was to keep traffic off Milton and Route 66. They have looked at other lots in the County for example; on Leupp Road and out in Bellemont, but there are not many large acre sites that are light industrial. Mr. Hotsenpiller discussed the agreement they have talked about with the Naval Observatory and has the recommendations written down for staff. He discussed the different lightings for different zoning to the Commission. Mr. Hotsenpiller stated they do have a weed survey proposal and a grant for a fire management plan and tree thinning. Commissioner Best asked if the map that is on the staff report shows the right number of acres. Mr. Hotsenpiller replied it is four parcels to make ten acres but they don't want to split any of the parcels. This was just for the County and Commission to see what the future could look like.

Commissioner Ontiveros wanted to clarify the lighting conditions, from the staff report, you would like to take out the staffs condition number five on lighting and replace with the Naval Observatory conditions. Mr. Hotsenpiller replied yes, they would like them changed.

Commissioner Ruggles stated the Standards Committee has addressed the issue about cumulative lighting in zone changes and lot splits. It has been a long time since this was brought up. They are trying to find the best way to address this in the update of the Counties Ordinance.

There was no more questions for the applicant and it was opened to the public for discussion.

Mr. Prema, lives at Equestrian Estates, talked about the history of Mr. Van Beeks projects and the people he hires, and he is in support of this project.

Lael Knodel, 6050 W Saskan Ranch Circle, Flagstaff Arizona 86001, read a letter about her family's background and history in Flagstaff. Ms. Knodel and her husband are a part of the Home Owners Association for Saskan Ranch. If this property is re-zoned it will cause a domino effect and the surrounding parcels in the future may become light industrial as well. This would affect the current home owners. She thinks her concerns were minimized in the staff report. They didn't move to the country to listen to back-up alarms on construction vehicles. They also know that there are more properties out there that are already zoned light industrial that they could have chosen for their business. Ms. Knodel does not think this zone change can meet the three Findings of Fact. Chairman Walters asked how close her property is to the proposed property. Ms. Knodel replied they overlook this property and are adjacent to the property to the south.

Jason Aulwis, 6100 W Saskan Ranch Circle, Flagstaff Arizona 86001, stated he is opposed to the zone change. He would not like to live next to a heavy equipment yard. He read the Comprehensive Plan's Growth and Land Use policy that he believes supports his concerns. Mr. Aulwis explained the differences he found between the County and the City's Comprehensive plans about the Saskan Ranch area. Chairman Walters asked where his property was to the proposed property. Mr. Aulwis replied right next to it.

Jody Pasut, 6100 W Sasken Ranch Circle, Flagstaff Arizona 86001 stated her parcel is adjacent to Mr. Van Beeks and Mr. Mongini's. She talked about the history of her family and what made them move to Saskan Ranch. Ms. Pasut talked about the noise that the vehicles and the shop equipment will be giving off which is only 50 feet away. The roads will not be paved making these vehicles kick up dust as they drive down. Ms. Pasut also noted the dark skies that they desire will be lost due to the lights on his adjacent buildings and industrial staging yard. She discussed the difference her property value will change to if it is next to a construction yard. Commissioner Ontiveros asked that being adjacent to this property, does she feel the noise, specifically back up alarms is going to affect her. At her property does she now hear the backup alarms from the Waste Management facility? Ms. Pasut replied the noise is faint and that is something they were listening for when they first bought the property.

Paul Stearns, 6020 W Sasken Ranch Circle, Flagstaff Arizona 86001 stated he agrees with his neighbors about the backup alarms and how you can hear them all the time. He opposes the project and thinks it does not go with the Comprehensive Plan or the Findings of Fact. Mr. Stearns asked what the hours will be for this yard, morning or night. He asked the Commission if they would put this behind other residential properties, and talked about the safety of cyclist, walkers and runners on Route 66.

Wenda Seltzer, 6150 W Sasken Ranch Circle, Flagstaff, Arizona 86001 explained she is one of the home owners that will be right next to the new parcel. She is not opposed to the company, they do good work in Northern Arizona but the project does not have to be on this parcel. Ms. Seltzer stated their property values in this area could go down because no one would want to live next to a contractor's yard. She opposes the buffer because she says most of the buffer is her property and she agrees with her neighbors about the noise problem.

Josh Huss, 3835 Harkey Ranch Rd, Flagstaff, Arizona 86001 stated he agreed with the previous neighbors' concerns and statements. He read a letter he wrote for the Commission stating his life background and that he opposes this project.

Syble Paris, 6600 W Sasken Ranch Way, Flagstaff Arizona 86001, stated she is the current HOA president, her property is not adjacent to this property but what will affect her neighbors will also affect them. Ms. Paris talked about fire prevention that would need to be done and she has the same noise concerns as the previous speakers. The neighborhood does not want a commercial business going in on this property, even in the future.

Larry Wiles, 6375 W Sasken Ranch Circle, Flagstaff Arizona 86001, discussed the history of Saskan Ranch starting in 1985 and that he is opposed to this project.

Tim Boicourt, 6595 W Sasken Ranch Way, Flagstaff Arizona 86001, stated he owns a parcel but has not built a home on the property. He explained that he used to work on a construction yard and the hours will be all hours of the day especially when working emergencies. When you buy a house out there you expect to not see or hear a construction yard. Mr. Boicourt said a concern is what crime the construction building could bring to it or other houses.

Arron Paris, 6600 W Sasken Ranch Way, Flagstaff, Arizona 86001 stated he is on the far side of the neighborhood. One of his concerns is what it would mean for the future rezoning of properties. Mr. Paris does not believe the Findings of Fact can be found on this project.

Donald Olfers, 4656 W Route 66, Flagstaff, Arizona 86001, stated his property is 800 feet to the north east from the proposed property. He agreed with the concerns of the previous neighbors. They do hear the noise from the Waste Management facility, the backup alarms are not what bothers them it is the dumping of the dumpsters at 5:00 in the morning. Mr. Olfers discussed the safety issues of driving and turning off Route 66.

Ben Butler, 4880 W Route 66, Flagstaff, Arizona 86001, stated his property is directly across the street from the proposed property. This property will have a street that ends at a hill and you will not be able to see heavy equipment entering and leaving the property.

Rollie Kohl, 4550 W Route 66, Flagstaff Arizona 86001, stated his property is a little more removed from the area. He doesn't have the same concerns as his neighbors but since it affects his neighbors, it affects him. He stated that with the noise complaints, they do have a lot of different commercial buildings out there. Individually the noises are not that bad, but put them all together and it is noticeable. Mr. Kohl explained that he used to participate in bicycle races and the safety issues they used to have. He explained that where the entrance will be to get to the proposed property will be a very dangerous spot.

Drew Kohl, 4652 W Route 66, Flagstaff Arizona 86001, stated his property is about 1000 feet away from the property. He would like to conserve the rural atmosphere of this property, and he agrees with the concerns of Mr. Kohl's road safety.

Shawn Frate, 6400 W Sasken Ranch Circle, Flagstaff Arizona 86001, summarized his history and concerns with a slide show presentation. He explained what would happen if the property were to split in the future and things that have come up at previous meetings. Mr. Frate explained that none of the neighbors of the proposed property were in favor of this project or zone change and does not think the Findings of Fact can be made.

Frank Dickens, 11 W Cheryl Dr, Phoenix Arizona 85021, stated he owns property at Flagstaff Ranch Rd. He explained that he was on the Comprehensive Plan board in 2000 and that is when they discussed the Gateway corridor for light industrial. The plan was for industrial and commercial to be minimized because of I-40 but Flagstaff City is planning on building a 21 million dollar maintenance facility along route 66. He has not heard anyone opposing that project. The Comprehensive Plan states there are other uses that can go in this



zone for example a shopping mall. What they are doing here is the best use of the property. Mr. Dickens believes Mr. Van Beek would be a good neighbor for this neighborhood. Business and housing can co-exist.

There were no more public to speak for this case, it was closed to the public. There was a 5 min break and then opened to the Commission for discussion.

Commissioner Williams stated what Mr. Van Beek's business brings to Northern Arizona is incredible and a huge asset but she is opposed to this zone change. After visiting the site multiple times, there are a lot more properties out there that are zoned light industrial, available and also have great access to the freeways. Commissioner Best concurs with Commissioner Williams about there being other properties the applicant can choose from. The Commission has discussed gateways before. They tend to be outside of town but we want to maintain gateways for the Flagstaff experiences. He cannot make the Findings and does not think this is consistent for what the plans call for a gateway. Commissioner Best stated he cannot say this will affect the adjacent properties, but the applicant does make a good plan for the area and no one knows what the future may bring to this property. He cannot make the Findings of Fact for this proposed project.

Commissioner Ruggles stated he spent time looking at this and after visiting the site with staff, he wrote all his concerns and conclusions down to read here tonight. He read a statement from a story written by Justice Sullivan. It addresses all of the issues that are in front of the Commission tonight mainly the appropriateness of a zoning for the location. Commissioner Ruggles stated future uses of this property must be thought about as well. Rezoning to light industrial serves to set an undesirable precedence for the rezoning of the two parcels to the south. He cannot make the three Findings of Fact for the zone change of the CUP.

Commissioner Sacher commended the applicant for making the necessary changes from the original site plan. She can make Finding One and Three but is struggling with number two, she does believe this is consistent with the Flagstaff Regional plan. Commissioner Sacher stated her concern that if this does not pass tonight, the future could be a lot worse. There is a lot of potential for this site. She doesn't know this company well but they have done a job up by where she lives and they were polite workers and did a good job. She wanted to remind everyone the photos shown here are not what is being proposed. Commissioner Sacher also stated she does think this will make a beautiful corridor piece, because from the highway you cannot even see where the equipment is going to be due to all the trees surrounding the property.

Commissioner Doggett said that his concern is, having seen the Regional Plan and in terms of the recommended Use and potential for this site, he does agree that some Light Industrial would be good for this area, but the Use is inappropriate for this site. He cannot make the Findings of Fact for this rezoning. Commissioner Doggett discussed two previous cases that were similar in that they were only going to use a piece of the property and had a lot of opposition from the neighbors. The neighbors would probably agree to this rezoning and CUP if the Use was smaller.

Commissioner Ontiveros asked Mr. McNeel about the Comprehensive Plan and the  
COCONINO COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 28TH, 2015

Flagstaff Regional Plan. These two documents are supposed to help us decide but it is sounding like they are giving two different directions to choose from. Mr. McNeel replied that the order you should base your decisions on is Coconino County Ordinance first, the Comprehensive Plan next, and then look at the Regional Plan. Chairman Walters, Mr. McNeel and Mr. Christelman discussed which plans can be used today, existing and the ones that are being adopted. Commissioner Ontiveros read the section of the Comprehensive plan she is asking about.

Commissioner Ontiveros stated that she visited the site, walked it from side to side with staff and wanted to address the concerns that the citizens brought up tonight. She thought that the issue about the visual has been addressed with the way the project is going to go forward with the topography. The other issue was the speculation. Conditions number two and three that were recommended in the staff report addressed this. Commissioner Ontiveros also stated that the dark sky issue has also been addressed when the applicant worked with the Naval Observatory, but the noise is what she has concerns with. In the proposed condition number six, it was to be believed that the noise would be 24 hours a day, but in actuality it would be from 6:00 am to 6:00 pm on weekdays and 7:00 am to 7:00pm on weekends. She does not believe this will cause a negative impact to the gateway corridor. Commissioner Ontiveros stated that she understood what the applicant was saying when he said he would lose business if he is required to have all the equipment on his property at all times, but as far as the transient issue in the area, she thinks this will deter them.

Commissioner Ontiveros asked Mr. Christelman if the Flagstaff Regional Plan has any kind of transitioned guidance when moving from residential to M-1-10,000 property. Mr. Christelman replied that the language is similar between the two Plans. Commissioner Ontiveros stated that she does think the applicant has done a good job on hearing what the communities concerns have been and tried to accommodate. Chairman Walters stated that he concurs with Commissioner Ontiveros and discussed that he was on the Regional and Comprehensive Plan committees. He has also visited the site a couple times and has read all of the staff reports and documents. He said that the neighbors do have some valid concerns. Regarding the noise issue he stated that there is so much noise with the current situations that the neighbors have. For example: Route 66, the train and I-40. He does not see the noise of the new proposal being a major issue. Chairman Walters explained to the public his part and his duties as the Chairman as related to making decisions for cases.

Commissioner Ontiveros asked the other Commissioners if they may have changed their positions after hearing the other two speak. Commissioner Ruggles said that after hearing their discussion, his vote stays the same. He cannot make the Findings of Fact. If there were some kind of buffer between Residential and Light Industrial then he may be able to make the Findings to support the zone change and CUP. Commissioner Ruggles explained that he is looking at the future and that this is the kind of business that we want in Northern Arizona, it is just not the right place. Commissioner Ontiveros replied we do not know what will happen in the future. What we are making a decision on tonight is what is in front of us. We have seen what the Use is going to do, its contractor's yard and it will not be the Chino Valley pictures they have shown here. Commissioner Ruggles replied that if they were given the certainty that this Use would be the only thing on the property now and in the future he may be able to change his vote.

Ms. Morley clarified for the Commissioners that the applicant is asking for the ten acres. Staff proposed 4 acres for the rezoning and CUP, but if the Commission decided to put in a condition, then the CUP could be limited for the whole ten acres. Commissioner Ontiveros asked the other Commissioners how they would feel if they were only rezoning the portion Vastco intends to use. Commissioner Best replied that his opinion does not change in light of these new facts because it is still not clear what will happen with the other acres and what will come in. it has potential to come in as Commercial. Maybe the applicant would like to have a continuance and look at the property to see if there is a better area for this. Commissioner Sacher said she is concerned after hearing the other Commissioners. They are all concerned about the future. When a project is brought to them in the future, they can process and decide on them then. She understands the neighbors' concerns but she thinks Mr. Van Beek would be a good neighbor and there may be some advantages for a contractor's yard nearby. Commissioner Williams stated she has also been to the site and has gone back and forth on this issue. From a planning perspective she feels that this is not the time or place for this zone change. Commissioner Doggett stated that he still cannot make the Findings of Fact and this is not the best plan they can see. Commissioner Ruggles stated that based on the Commissioners discussion, the applicant might want to ask for a continuance to make a better plan. If they recommend denial, then the applicant will need four out of five Board of Supervisor to approve.

Chairman Walters asked the applicant to come back up to the podium.

Mr. Hotsenpiller asked the Commission for a continuance of 120 days. Commissioner Ontiveros stated she would like the neighbors to listen to everything that was heard tonight and would be willing to work with the applicant for the next meeting.

**Motion-** Commissioner Doggett made a motion to continue ZC-15-004 and CUP-15-015 for 120 days until the Feb. 24<sup>th</sup> 2016 P&Z Meeting. Commissioner Williams seconded the motion. Motion was approved unanimously.

2. Case No. CUP-15-030: A request for renewal without modifications of CUP-07-042 for an existing 70-foot wireless communications tower (monopole). The property is located at 12000 W. Rte. 66, Flagstaff, AZ and consists of 4.65 acres in the Planned Community Zone in an area designated for heavy commercial uses and is identified as Assessor's Parcel No. 204-03-001H.

Applicant: Crown Castle c/o Marken Telecom Services, Longmont, CO

Property Owner: Arizona North Properties, Scottsdale, AZ

Supervisory District: 3 (Matt Ryan)

Mr. Short summarized the staff report along with a PowerPoint presentation noting that staff is recommending approval.

There were no questions for staff. It was closed and opened to the applicant for discussion.

Mark Sawyer, 3308 Binch Rd, Longmont Colorado 80509. stated he would like to put on the record condition number three. The weed management is a tenant issue and they

will make sure the tenant is aware of this issue. For the extension of time, they would respectively ask for the time frame to be five years. Chairman Walters explained that in previous cases of late applicants, this has been granted. If there are no changes, then this can be done administratively.

Commissioner Doggett asked why Crown Castle missed the expiration date. Mr. Sawyer replied that Crown Castle purchased the tower from T-Mobile who did not renew their permits. Chairman Walters asked the applicant if he read all the conditions and agreed with them. Mr. Sawyer replied he agreed.

No public was in attendance for this case. It was closed and open for Commission discussion.

**Motion-** Commissioner Doggett made a motion approve CUP-15-030 with the stipulations made by staff. Commissioner Ruggles seconded the motion. Motion was approved unanimously.

3. Case Nos. CUP-15-031 and DRO-15-004: A request for a Conditional Use Permit and Design Review Overlay zone approval for a 140 ft. wireless, monopine communications tower on 7.91 acres in the Resort Commercial (RC) Zone. The property is located at 8351 US 89A, Sedona, AZ and is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 405-36-053A.  
Applicant: Centerline Solutions, Sedona, Arizona  
Property Owner: JP Resort Property Owner's Assoc.  
Supervisory District: 3 (Matt Ryan)

Mr. Short summarized the staff report along with a PowerPoint presentation noting that staff is recommending approval. Commissioner Ontiveros asked if the only change would be that this monopine will replace the monopole already there. Mr. Short replied "yes".

There were no additional questions for staff and it was opened to the applicant for questions.

Shirley Crowder, 4636 E Elwood St. Suite 7, Phoenix Arizona 85040, stated she works for Centerline Solutions and is a representative for Verizon Wireless. She discussed what they will be building, the plans and the benefits of the wireless tower. Chairman Walters asked the Ms. Crowder if she has read the staff report and agrees with it. Ms. Crowder replied that she does.

Commissioner Ruggles stated he was satisfied with the fall zone letter.

There were no further questions for applicant. No public was in the audience for this case and it was opened to the Commission for discussion.

Commissioner Ruggles asked that condition number five say that the tower color shall correspond to the surrounding natural environment rather than earth tone colors.

**Motion-** Commissioner Ruggles made a motion to approve CUP-15-031 with the following change to condition number five “the tower color shall correspond to the surrounding natural environment as approved by the Director of Community Development”. Commissioner Williams seconded the motion. Motion approved 5-0-1 with Commissioner Doggett abstaining. Commissioner Williams made a motion to approve DRO-15-004 with the following change to condition number five; “The tower color shall correspond to the surrounding natural environment as approved by the Director of Community Development”. Commissioner Ontiveros seconded the motion. Motion was approved 5-0-1 with Commissioner Doggett abstaining.

4. Case No. CUP-15-033: A request for a Conditional Use Permit for an airstrip and airplane hangar and storage hangars at the Walking Cane Ranch. The property consists of 115 acres in the General (G) Zone and is identified 8 Walking Cane Ranch Road and as Assessor’s Parcel No. 303-03-010C.

Applicant: Adam Deibel, Flagstaff, AZ

Property Owner: Shana Sequoia Turrell, Flagstaff, AZ

Supervisory District: 4 (Mandy Metzger)

Mr. Schwartz summarized the staff report along with a PowerPoint presentation noting that staff is recommending approval.

Chairman Walters asked what the runway surfaces will be. Mr. Schwartz said now it is only native grass and it has been graded. There is no standard in the Ordinance for runway pavement and the FFA does not have any particular surfacing that they require.

There were no further questions for staff. It was closed and opened to the applicant.

Adam Deibel, 8525 N Chimney Springs Trail, Flagstaff Arizona 86001, stated that the staff did a good job and they had nothing further to add. Chairman Walters asked if he had read the staff report and agreed with it. Mr. Deibel replied that he did. The runway is currently dirt and they will improve it, but there is no time line set as of now.

There were no further questions for the applicant and no public for this case. It was opened to the Commission for their discussion.

Commissioner Ruggles stated that he visited the site with staff and can concur with the staff recommendations.

**Motion-** Commissioner Ruggles made a motion to approve CUP-15-033 with the conditions as stated by staff. Commissioner Williams seconded the motion. Motion was approved unanimously.

5. Case No. CUP-15-034 and DRO-15-003: A request for a Conditional Use Permit and a Design Review Overlay to update an existing lodge for short-term rentals and large events. The property is located at 6401 N. State Route 89A, Sedona, AZ and consists of 2.42 acres in the Commercial General (CG-10,000) Zone and is identified as Assessor's Parcel No. 405-20-010A.

Applicant: Dina Riggs, Flagstaff, AZ

Property Owner: AMMR LLC, Flagstaff, AZ

Supervisory District: 3 (Matt Ryan)

Mr. Short summarized the staff report along with a PowerPoint presentation noting staff is recommending approval.

Commissioner Doggett asked about the shuttle for the larger events particularly where the shuttle would be coming from. Mr. Short deferred the question to the applicant. Chairman Walters stated that when looking at the drawings, he noticed that they were not done by a commercial architect. Ms. Riggs replied that the architect stamped copies are with the building permit copies.

Commissioner Best asked if there is a problem with where the shed is located. Mr. Short replied that they have not received any complaints related to where the shed is now and it does not cause issues in that location. A neighbor replied that it was a good buffer from the activities.

There were no additional questions for staff and it was opened it to applicant for discussion.

Dina Riggs, 1808 N Edgewood Flagstaff Arizona 86004, discussed details about what would be changed on the property. They have heard the concerns of their neighbors and want to be a positive impact to the neighborhood. They want to improve the property from what it has been. In reply to the noise concern of the neighbors, Ms. Riggs said that they are very conscience of that and they know that the Canyon has a set quiet time.

Commissioner Ruggles stated that he visited the property with staff and looked at everything that needs to be done before it can be operational. He would like to know what the time line for the project will be to completion. Ms. Riggs replied that it depends on when they can get their building permit from the County to start working, but they anticipate not going longer than three to four months.

Commissioner Doggett asked where the shuttle would come from. Ms. Riggs replied that they have spoken to a couple of event planners who already do events in the canyon and there would be shuttle services that already run the area. These shuttles will tell the people where to pick them up.

Chairman Walters asked if the vegetation has grown back from the recent fires. Ms. Riggs replied that the fire did not reach their property and there is a lot of rock around them. Chairman Walters asked if they have access to the creek from the property. Ms. Riggs replied that yes they do, but it is a very treacherous area. They stated that they would have to

reconstruct the walking trail because it is presently only for their water rights. The water pump sits down in the creek. Ms. Riggs explained that it has “keep out” signs so that the public does not use it until it is improved. Chairman Walters asked the applicant if they read the staff report and agreed with it. Ms. Riggs replied she did.

There were no other questions for the applicant and it was opened to the public for discussion.

Malaine Pfeifer -6425 N. Hwy 89A, Sedona Arizona 86336, gave a brief history about her and her husband and the land around them. She stated that their concerns are about noise, law enforcement, traffic, privacy and who will monitor the events. Ms. Pfeifer agrees with having small events there, but not large events due to noise. In the Canyon, noise is magnified. Some recommendations she has are acoustic music, quiet times from 9 pm to 9 am and fire danger precautions. Ms. Pfeifer stated that she still had a lot of questions that she would like answered before the approval of this CUP. For example: how will the event planner keep the people from going in unauthorized areas and how many events can be permitted during a year?

Bob Kirch, 31715 Greythorne Way, Chandler Arizona 85248 explained where his property is located and stated that he concurred with a lot of what Ms. Pfeifer has discussed. He had some recommendations that he would like to be added to the conditions: no more than 60 people (including the onsite guests), no more than ten events the first year of operation, no more than 20 events the next few years and an onsite representative from AMMR because an event planner would not have the same authority as someone from the LLC. He is very excited about them coming into this property, however he would like a couple of conditions to be added to insure that the neighborhood stays the same. Chairman Walters asked if he has been able to sit down with the applicant and go over his concerns. Mr. Kirch replied “No, because they just got the notification on the 12<sup>th</sup>”. He did go to the meet and greet but still had questions.

There were no other questions for the public. Chairman Walters asked Mr. Short back to the podium for questions.

Chairman Walters asked if there were conditions they would like to change. Mr. Short replied that the applicant suggested 80 people at the event. However he feels that, it is a little hard to judge. It could be lowered to 60 people, but that would be a small event. Staff may add a condition to the staff report addressing a maximum number of events per year, but that would be difficult to monitor. Commissioner Ruggles asked if they shorten the length of the CUP, if they can revisit the conditions based on the feedback from the neighbors and staff.

Kyler Gross, 4488 E Rustic Knolls, Flagstaff Arizona 86004, discussed that Ms. Riggs and he have put a lot into this project and would like to see it through. He explained that they would not want to have this property ruined or the neighborhood disturbed. They have talked with some event planners about the situations and they explained that someone will be on the property when events are happening.

Commissioner Ontiveros asked the applicant to define “large event”. “Does this mean 80 people”? Mr. Gross replied “yes” For the response to the ten events a year statement, they were planning on having two to three events a weekend in the busy season. Commissioner Ontiveros asked what the busy season would be. Ms. Riggs replied March through May and September through November. Commissioner Ontiveros asked for a maximum number of events they planned on. Ms. Riggs replied about 50 per year. Ms. Riggs explained that when they say “events” it is not just weddings they are talking about they would also like to have baby showers, reunions, bridal showers etc. Chairman Walters asked if they have ever run an event like this one. Ms. Riggs replied that they do have vacation rentals. Mr. Gross stated that they would have their own event planner on site along with the planner that the clients hired.

Chairman Walters asked if the applicants would like to continue this case for thirty days to have another meeting with the neighbors. Commissioner Doggett stated all of the questions that the neighbors and Commissioners had for the applicants to answer at the next meeting. The Commissioners agreed a continuance would be best at this time.

**Motion-** Commissioner Doggett made a motion to continue CUP-15-034 and DRO-15-003 until the December 2<sup>nd</sup> P&Z Meeting. Commissioner Best seconded the motion. Motion was approved unanimously.

### **III. CALL TO PUBLIC FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

There were no comments.

Meeting adjourned at 10:25pm

---

Chairperson, Coconino County  
Planning and Zoning Commission

ATTEST:

---

Secretary, Coconino County  
Planning and Zoning Commission